IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.SIRI JAGAN

TUESDAY, THE 24TH JULY 2007 / 2ND SRAVANA 1929

WP(C).No. 22678 of 2007(Y)

PETITIONER:

SHEELA GOPINATHAN, ULLATTIL HOUSE,
P.O.VALAPPAD, THRISSUR DISTRICT,
PIN-680567.

BY ADV. SRI.K.K.JAYASOORIAN
SRI.P.M.KUNJIMOIDEENKUTTY
SRI.LAL K.JOSEPH
SRI.A.A.ZIYAD RAHMAN
SMT.SHEENA SAMUEL

RESPONDENTS:

---

1. THE PROJECT MANAGER,
NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA,
OFFICE OF THE PROJECT DIRECTOR, & MANAGER,
"TUSHAR BINDU", NO.337, CHANDRA NAGAR,
NARIKODE, PALAKKAD.

2. THE MANAGER(TECH) NATIONAL HIGHWAY
AUTHORITY OF INDIA,
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY COLLECTOR NHDP,
CHEMBUKAVU, THRISSUR.

3. THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR,
THRISSUR.

4. THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,
OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,
N.H.BRIDGES DIVISIONS, KODUNGALLOOR,
THRISSUR DISTRICT.

BY SRI.P. PARAMESWARAN NAIR – ASST.SOL.GENERAL

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 24/07/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

S. SIRI JAGAN, J.

W.P.(C)NO. 22678 OF 2007

DATED THIS THE 24th DAY OF JULY, 2007

JUDGMENT

The petitioner sought certain information from 1st and 2nd respondents under the Right to Information Act. The same was not supplied. Therefore, the petitioner has approached this Court seeking the following reliefs.

> "i) issue a writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ or order directing the 1st and 2nd respondents to furnish all the details as requested by the petitioner in Ext.P4 application immediately.
>
> ii) issue a writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ or order directing 1st and 2nd respondents to take appropriate action upon Ext.P4 submitted by the petitioner immediately".

2. The Right to Information Act itself provides effective and adequate alternate remedies. The Act specifically stipulates that if within the time stipulated in the Act, information requested for has not been supplied, it would be deemed that the petitioner's request has been rejected. In such circumstance, the petitioner can file an appeal under Section 19 of the Act. The petitioner has still another remedy by way of approaching the State Information Commission directly in exercise of the powers of the Commission under Section 18(1)(c). In

such circumstances, I am not inclined to entertain this writ petition.

Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed without prejudice to the remedies available to the petitioner under the Right to Information Act itself.

S. SIRI JAGAN, JUDGE

Acd